



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XVIII
NUMBER 5

MAY, 1910

WHOLE
NUMBER 175

LATIN COMPOSITION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL II. AS THE MANUALS CONCEIVE IT

WM. GARDNER HALE
The University of Chicago

In a paper in the last number of this journal we reached the conclusion that college examination papers in composition are not, as a whole, carefully studied. In various instances, which we saw, they pass outside the range of ideas of the authors read, they call for words that are not common and constructions that are not common, and they leave many common constructions uncalled for.

We turn to the composition books written for high-school use. What are their plans, and what the execution of these plans? Are the books adapted to their task? Do they afford a maximum of effectiveness, with the practical minimum of labor on the part of student and teacher?

I have before me thirty-two books of which it seems desirable to speak. They constitute a tangled mass. I shall endeavor to throw them into classes, with a brief characterization of each book, and a fuller description of a few, selected as especially typical. I shall also have to confine myself mainly to the composition of the second year of the high school, that is, what is ordinarily called composition of the Caesar grade.

It will be easier to follow the discussion if the thread of it is

presented in advance. It may be said then, at once, that four more or less distinctly marked types of books appear, as follows :

I. A type without visible plan.

II. A type with "systematic" syntax, and English exercises taken at random from any part of Roman literature, or any part of some selected author or authors.

III. A type with exercises based upon a specified text, with syntax exhibited unsystematically.

IV. A type which attempts to *combine* a systematic syntax with exercises based upon a specified text.

We will take up these types in order.

I. *The type without any obvious principle of arrangement.*—To this belong two books by men who were destined to become widely known. The one is Gildersleeve's *Latin Exercise Book* (founded, as the author says, in the main on Lattmann's *Lateinisches Uebungsbuch*) (1871, reprinted as late, at least, as 1891). The other is (J. H.)¹ Allen and Greenough's *Latin Composition* (1875). In these books, one syntactical use after another is taken up, without a visible reason for the immediate choice. The material for the sentences covers a wide range. Thus one reads in some of the early pages of Gildersleeve's book: "The boy is killing the fly," "the kind teacher will free the modest scholar from punishment," "the beautiful beard of the black goat," "the liar is the most unprincipled of all men." In the second lesson of the Allen and Greenough book, one reads: "We have sworn together, three hundred noble youths, against Porsena," "the Academy introduced a new branch of knowledge (viz.) to know nothing," "Demetrius, an unprincipled Greek,

¹ Three Allens have been prominent among American classical scholars, and, I find, are often confused today. Two of them are mentioned in this article. Joseph H. Allen, whose name is especially associated with the Allen and Greenough textbooks, was lecturer in ecclesiastical history in Harvard University. William F. Allen, a brother of his, author, among other things, of editions of the *Agricola*, *Germania*, and *Annals* of Tacitus, was professor of Latin and history in the University of Wisconsin. The *Manual of Latin Grammar* (1868), out of which the Allen and Greenough *Latin Grammar* grew, was by William F. Allen and Joseph H. Allen. Frederic D. Allen, the reviser of the *Hadley Greek Grammar*, and author of a number of important monographs, was professor of classical philology in Harvard University. He was not related to the other two.

surrendered to the Romans the important island (of) Corcyra." One feels that the young student of that day was of a tougher fiber than his modern successor—and one seems to remember that he *was*.

II. *The type which aims primarily at a systematic presentation of syntax.*—This follows, in the main, the order in some particular grammar selected for the purpose. We think of it now as fairly old, and associate it especially with the name of Elisha Jones, of the University of Michigan. But it is older than this by many years. The earliest American example known to me is Andrews' *Latin Exercises, Adapted to Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar* (1839). A few pages of selected constructions are followed by a treatment of syntax which corresponds exactly, in expression and in order, to the rules of the grammar mentioned. The introduction states that, in this part of the work, "Dr. Kenrick's exercises, adapted to his translation of Zumpt's *Grammar*, have furnished many of the most valuable materials." They are taken from the whole range of Roman literature. The next example known to me is J. A. Spencer's *Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition* (1846), which is based upon Dr. Arnold's book of the same name. After a few selected topics, the cases are taken up systematically, each being completely dealt with before anything else is presented. The syntax of the verb follows, upon no apparent plan. The sentences are taken from anywhere, or made up from any material. There is no thread of unity, unless it be the unity afforded by the frequent reappearance of Balbus, who seems to be willing to do anything to illustrate a syntactical principle, and who certainly plays many parts which the real Balbus would have repudiated. Mullholland's edition of Arnold (1898) makes no radical changes of plan. Bradley's more recent edition (undated) rearranges and rewrites much of the matter, but, like the editions by Spencer and Mullholland, is systematic only in the treatment of the cases.

There followed a succession of books which Andrews must have influenced more than Arnold did, since they observe, more

nearly than the adaptations of the Arnold book, the order of rules in some grammar selected for the purpose.

Harkness' *A Practical Introduction to Latin Composition for Schools and Colleges* (1868) opens with a Part I which runs rapidly through the substance of the Harkness *Latin Grammar*, including forms as well as syntax. Then begins, at Part II, the Composition proper. The headings (that is, names of topics) and references follow exactly the order of the author's grammar. Each lesson contains: headings and references; a group of Latin "models," taken from any source, with English translations; remarks on these models; a special vocabulary; a set of sentences to be translated into Latin. The plan is excellent, if one is going to adopt the "systematic" scheme. This question will be discussed later. A footnote on the first page states that "this portion of the work is intended to accompany the reading of Caesar's *Commentaries on the Gallic War*." Numerals at the beginning of each lesson show the point which the student is supposed to have reached. The exercises of this part, which cover three books of Caesar, treat the cases very fully, but not much else (the verb comes later). Moreover, the actual sentences run forward and back in the *Gallic War*, and also often run quite outside of it. Nevertheless, the book not only exhibits a precise and consistent plan for its type (the books of Jones and Bennett exactly follow it), but also, through its stated progression in relation to the text of Caesar, hints at the possibility of the *complete* adaptation of exercises to a selected text, which forms the characteristic of a later type.

W. F. Allen's *Introduction to Latin Prose Composition* (1870), is built upon the *Manual of Latin Grammar*. The fifth edition (1873) is built upon the Allen and Greenough *Latin Grammar* instead. Except for a little discursiveness at the beginning, the order in this grammar is exactly followed. The material to be translated into Latin is taken from anywhere. The revised edition (1880) prefixes to the original matter a more elementary portion, written by J. H. Allen, with the co-operation of John Tetlow and the criticism of Tracy Peck. The plan of this part is the same as that of the other.

Jones's *Exercises in Latin Prose Composition* (1879) is of essentially the same character, with the arrangement seen in Harkness' book, except that notes and questions follow the exercises. The verb is treated before the noun. At the end, thirteen pages of "exercises for general review and examination" are added, made up from any source. References are given throughout the book to Allen and Greenough's *Grammar*, Andrews and Stoddard's *Grammar*, Bartholomew's *Grammar*, Bullion and Morris' *Grammar*, Gildersleeve's *Grammar*, and Harkness' *Grammar*—names in part unknown to the student of today. A revised edition by J. H. Drake, of the University of Michigan (1897), marks all quantities, and gives exercises upon the *Gallic War* and Cicero's *Orations* in place of the former exercises at the end. A revision by the same author (1905) gives references to the Allen and Greenough *Grammar*, the Hale and Buck *Grammar*, Bennett's *Grammar*, the Gildersleeve and Lodge *Grammar*, and Harkness' *Grammar*. Between the two editions of 1879 and 1905, then, three once much-used grammars were thought to have passed away, and two new ones had arisen which were thought worth referring to. Three had held their own.

Gildersleeve and Lodge's *Latin Composition* was published in 1899 (new edition in 1904); and Bennett's *Preparatory Latin Writer* in 1905. I select these two for an examination of the "systematic" plan.

The syntax of the Gildersleeve-Lodge book of 1904 (to proceed at once to this edition) is systematic, and follows the order in the Gildersleeve-Lodge *Grammar*, with references also to Allen and Greenough, Bennett, Harkness, Hale and Buck, Lane, and West; but the footnotes, on which the working of the book in measurable part depends, refer to the Gildersleeve-Lodge *Grammar* alone. The topics deal wholly with the verb, the cases being taken up only incidentally. The sentences "are frankly translated or adapted from accepted Latin models." They cover a wide range of ideas. Thus, in the second group, "I am inclined to think that Hannibal was more wonderful in adversity than in prosperity," and "Should you not have replied that that could

not happen unless the government were overthrown?", in the fifth, "Are you sorry or glad that your mother-in-law has hanged herself?" The exercises of the first part are made up of detached sentences. Those of the second part are in paragraphs of continuous sentences, and are likewise taken from a great variety of sources.

The most rigorous application of the systematic method, after Harkness' book, has been made in Bennett's *Preparatory Latin Writer*, which is described as based on Caesar; along with which must be mentioned the same author's *Latin Composition*, described as based on Cicero. These books are more typical than Harkness', because each covers the entire ground of the grammar in what is planned for a year of work. The general arrangement is identical with that of Harkness' book—for each lesson, headings with grammatical references (in Bennett, to the grammars of Bennett, Allen and Greenough, and Harkness); Latin examples, translated; remarks on the examples; a special vocabulary; and a set of exercises, to which Bennett has often added "suggestions." The *Preparatory Latin Writer* (the plan is the same for the *Latin Composition*) is not "based" on Caesar, in the more restricted sense in which the word is generally now used, namely, that of exact adaptation. Some of the material is from other sources. The incidents that *are* from Caesar are not given with any reference to the order in which students meet them in their reading. Thus in Lesson I the student has to translate "the Helvetians were routed and sued for peace (from i, 26 and 27, which he would reach at about the end of the autumn quarter), "the son of Ariovistus was captured" (suggested by i, 53, though it is not mentioned that Ariovistus had a son), "the Veneti, a most warlike tribe, got ready a large fleet" (iii, 9), and "Octodurus, the winter-quarters of Galba, was a village of the Veragri" (iii, 1). In Lesson V he finds "the soldiers who had crossed the Rhine followed their commander into Germany," which belongs to the incidents of the fourth book. In the fourteenth lesson, Vercingetorix of the seventh book appears.

The special vocabularies, as is inevitable upon such a plan,

bear but a moderate relation to the part of Caesar in which the student is reading. Thus, of the twenty words given in the vocabulary of the first lesson, ten do not occur in the first ten chapters of Caesar, and seven do not occur in the first twenty-nine chapters (the entire *Helvetian War*).

The forty-four regular lessons of the book are provided with a rather long set of exercises each, made up of disjointed sentences. Here and there a shorter passage of continuous English is *added* to a lesson. There are fourteen of these passages. At the end of the lessons there are twenty-six "supplementary exercises in continued discourse." But few schools would reach this part of the book.

As for the syntactical features, the plan is, again, rigorously like that of Harkness. With only a little deviation at the beginning it follows the author's grammar, section by section, omitting scarcely anything.

Such a treatment seems in theory admirable. One learns everything about a certain kind of thing, and then everything about some other kind of thing, and so on; and, moreover, one is becoming acquainted with a grammar at the same time. But, in order to make the method really what it professes to be, one should not *use* any kind of thing until he has learned about it. This seems supremely difficult to carry out, and, in fact, is not carried out. Thus the Gildersleeve-Lodge book takes up, in the first lesson, interrogative sentences (all existing books make much of these, though they practically do not appear in the high-school Caesar reading). But the sentences given, in this same lesson, for translation into Latin cover not only a variety of case-uses (e.g., the possessive and partitive genitives, the dative after verbs of injuring and serving, the ablative of time, the ablative of cause), but also a variety of mood-uses not provided for in the heading, which is "Interrogative Sentences" (e.g., the infinitive in indirect discourse, relative clauses in indirect discourse, the choice of mood in the *cum*-clause, and the relative clause of "characteristic"). The same contradiction appears in Bennett's book. The eleventh lesson, for instance, takes up the genitives—of origin, of material, of possession, subjective, ob-

jective; and the twelfth continues with the partitive genitive and others. But the English of the *first* lesson calls for the genitive of origin and the genitive of possession, of the *second* lesson, for the genitive of material and the partitive genitive. The ablative of "specification" is treated in the nineteenth lesson, but has to be written in the fifth (a note says "express by the simple ablative"). The ablative of the time-within-which is treated in the twenty-first lesson, but has to be written in the eighth (a note says "express by the ablative").

Moreover, it is obvious that such a system *cannot* be adapted to any definite text. There is no passage, for example, where Caesar has used all the genitives of Bennett's grammar, then all the datives, then all the accusatives, and so on; and, in fact, many of them are not used at all by Caesar. *Consequently, the illustrative Latin examples* which are given in each lesson after the grammatical references *have to be taken from a wide range of Latin literature*; and very few of them are, in fact, from Caesar. Thus, of the fourteen given for the first lesson, only one is from Caesar, and this is from the fourth book. All are translated, to be sure; but they belong mostly to ideas far afield from the student's reading, and are full of words which the student has never seen. Accordingly, these illustrations, if they are really studied, demand large additional effort. An example may be seen in Lesson XXVIII, sentence 8 of the illustrative examples, *Ciceronem cuicumque Graecorum fortiter opposuerim*, "I should boldly match Cicero with any of the Greeks," which is adapted from Quintilian's *Institutes*, x. 1. 105. Nor does it make the case any better that the construction does not occur at all in Caesar. This is likewise true of illustrations 4, 5, 6, *quaerat quispiam, dixerit aliquis, vix verisimile videatur*. These certainly have no place in the Caesar year.

In general, the idea of system has carried the author far. The number of constructions treated which do not occur in Caesar is very great. Thus the accusative of respect as in *vir cetera egregius*, the accusative in *aliquid id genus*, the genitive with verbs of plenty or want, the genitive with verbs of judicial action (*accuso, damno*, etc.), the ablative with *dignus or indignus*, two

accusatives with verbs of teaching, and the retention of one with the passive voice, the subjunctive *qui*-clause after *dignus*, *indignus*, or *idoneus*, the subjunctive of proviso with *modo*, *dum*, and *dummodo*, the subjunctive of concession with *quamvis*, do not occur in the high-school Caesar, and most of them do not occur anywhere in the *Gallic War*. The genitive with verbs of reminding is treated, though it *does not occur anywhere in the whole range of high-school Latin*. Many constructions are also treated that are *rare* in Caesar. Thus the double accusative with verbs of asking is dealt with in the sixth lesson, and the word given for *ask* in the vocabulary is *rogo*. But our high-school Caesar has the construction but once, and there with *flagito*, not *rogo*; while our Cicero hasn't it at all. The retention of one accusative with the passive is taught and drilled upon, though it does not occur anywhere in high-school Latin.

The ironclad character of the author's plan is best seen if we compare it with that of his *Latin Composition (based on Cicero)*. Except for the vocabularies, English sentences to be translated, and accompanied suggestions, the two books are identical, lesson by lesson; and each is Bennett's grammar inverted, except that the shortness of the grammar makes it necessary to warn the Caesar or Cicero student against its omissions. Thus on p. 20 of each book we read:

1. *Id temporis, id aetatis*, "at that time," and *id genus*, "of that kind," were never frequently employed by Latin writers in good prose . . . ;

2. Observe that the accusative of the part affected (variously designated as Greek accusative, synecdochical accusative, and accusative of specification) is regularly confined to poetry; such expressions as Virgil's *os umerosque deo similis* should not be taken as models for prose writing.
. . . .

But surely constructions from Virgil and constructions "never frequently employed by Latin writers in good prose" can contribute nothing but confusion to the student of composition in either the Caesar or the Cicero year. They are here simply in deference to the idea of a "systematic presentation of the syntactical principles of the language," and because the treatment in the author's grammar is inadequate.

Before we leave the "systematic" type, we should note that, even in theory, it can be perfect only for those students who use the grammar preferred by the author of the composition book, since the order is not the same in the different grammars. Thus, for the five topics for which references are given in Bennett's seventeenth lesson to the grammars which he uses, the references to his own grammar run in beautiful sequence; but the references to Allen and Greenough run, 413, 409, 429, 404, 412.

III. *The type which aims primarily to connect the composition work, in subjects and vocabulary, with the reading which the student is doing.*—I am not sure whether the demand for this newer type sprang from the schools or from the colleges. A suggestion of the possibility of it, as we have seen, was quite clearly made in Harkness' book of 1868. I think it sure, too, that Mr. Collar and Mr. Daniell, whose interest in the idea will presently appear, were active in urging it. But, in any case, the *statement* of it was first made in explicit and effective form at a meeting of the Association of New England Colleges, held in December, 1879. My knowledge is due to the fact that I was one of the representatives who went from Harvard. While it was not I who asked for a statement of the plan which it was decided to promulgate, the phrase adopted after much searching around, and later put into print, namely, "based upon some portion of the prescribed prose," was of my coinage. I have had the pleasure of seeing the essential part of it pass into general use.

It was some time before the books began to base their work upon definite parts of the prescribed prose, though Harvard, at any rate, at once used the phrase in its catalogue (of 1880–81). The two earliest books of the newer type, Collar's *Practical Latin Composition* (1889) and Daniell's *Exercises in Latin Prose Composition* (the same year; new edition 1897, with the title *New Latin Composition*) responded extraordinarily. Collar says, "the exercises of this book are based on the Latin text in the last part of the volume" (the Seven Kings of Rome, Nepos, Caesar, Cicero). Daniell's book, more wisely, is "based," as the title says, "upon Caesar's *Gallic War*, books i–iv" and follows it,

chapter by chapter. Collar gave grammatical headings with references. Daniell in his first edition gave explanations and references in notes at the end of the book, but in the second gave headings and references. Some of Collar's exercises are in connected English. Daniell's are all disjointed. These were good books in their day; but both, in the desire to fit the material to the text, committed the grave mistake of making far too many exercises. I take this matter up presently, in speaking of another book. Rigg's *In Latinum*, which followed in the next year (1890), was likewise adapted to the *Gallic War*. A special feature is a group of questions in Latin, at the end of each set of exercises, the answers to which are to be given in Latin. The book was skilfully revised, and practically rewritten, in 1899 by H. P. Scott.

Moulton's *Preparatory Latin Composition*, published (with Collar's editorial assistance) in 1896 (new edition in 1904), follows the text of Caesar, and then of Cicero, chapter by chapter. Part II then gives 23 exercises of "systematic drill in syntax" on disconnected sentences, based on Caesar, Cicero, Nepos, and other authors. The English sentences for Caesar and Cicero are not only sensible and written in real English, but are, with few exceptions, connected. This fact marks a great advance. Moulton makes no special mention of it in his preface, but Collar, who had himself led the way in a part of the exercises in his own book, rightly dwells upon the point in his introduction.

But, in spite of this excellent feature, Moulton's book seems to me to have grave faults, which in general mark the whole type to which it belongs. Not only does it, like the books of the preceding type, deal with a great number of constructions which are non-existent or rare in Caesar, but, in its absorption in the idea of following the text, it takes up constructions as they happen to occur there, i.e., practically at random, without regard to their difficulty, or their interrelations. Thus the subjunctive *quin*-clause is called for in Moulton's third exercise, to translate "there is no doubt that." It is true that the construction does occur in chap. iii of Caesar. But it is one of the most difficult of all the subjunctive constructions, and ought to make its appearance, not

here, but relatively late in the composition book, after its more intelligible relations, the full consecutive clause with *ut*, and the corresponding substantive clause with *ut*, have come to be familiar tools in the student's hand. This kind of defect is regular in all the non-systematic books.

Another defect, of an almost universal character, lies in the heavily excessive number of the exercises. Thus Moulton's book has one set for every chapter of i-iv, except for a single case of combination. This makes 154 sets of exercises, that is, lessons. Now it is impossible to write any such number in the year. To do it would mean the writing of at least four lessons weekly. Most schools actually write an average of one a week, with a loss of one or two lessons in each quarter or semester. The inevitable omission of the larger part of the exercises in our books, or sentences in the exercises, makes trouble for the teacher, hurts the plan if there is one, and gives the student no sense of having mastered a definite task.

Finally, Moulton's book seems to me to have another fault (peculiar to only a few books) of a serious kind. The topics exemplified in a given lesson ought to be stated in the headings, and the student should then be left to exercise his judgment in the application, with such additional helps or cautions in the way of footnotes as may here and there seem wise. Moulton's book has no headings. The lessons consist entirely of English sentences for translation, with interspersed references to footnotes, which footnotes refer to sections in the grammars. But this system tells the student *precisely what case, or precisely what mood or tense*, to write. It thus not only makes it unnecessary for him to *think* what to write in the individual place, but also must make the general impression produced by the construction in his mind a passing one, and correspondingly feeble.

Abbott's *A First Latin Writer* (1904) gives an arranged syntax, with subject-matter taken mostly from the second book of Caesar, but without designation of the exact places. The sentences are continuous, and read easily and naturally. But many incidents are introduced which are not in Caesar's narrative, and not only did not happen but would not have happened, as in

Lesson V, where Caesar is made to send word to the beleagured Remi that he will dispatch help, "but that he shall demand six hundred hostages in order that Iccius may not conspire against him." The Remi had already joined Caesar, had made themselves very useful to him by furnishing information, and had *already* given hostages—presumably not on so large a scale. Such a message as is here invented would have sent them straight over to the enemy. Caesar was a better diplomat than this. The preface says that "phrases and constructions of infrequent occurrence have been omitted." But many that do not occur in Caesar at all are included.

In 1905, Daniell, with the assistance of S. L. Brown, revised and rewrote the later Daniell book, giving to the new one the same title of *New Latin Composition*. The "systematic" idea is rejected by the authors, until Part III is reached, where a systematic "Grammatical Review" is very properly given. In Part I the text of Caesar, i-iv, is followed, chapter by chapter; in Part II, the text of six orations of Cicero. At the head of the sentences corresponding to a given chapter, the authors have set the name of a construction (occasionally two constructions), with references to several grammars. These headings succeed one another in no visible principle of order. Thus "(1) Subject Nominative; Predicate Nominative; (2) Dative with Special Verbs; (3) Clauses of Purpose with *ut*." The larger amount of each Part is given up to sentences "for oral translation," these sentences being unconnected. Then follows, in each Part, consecutive material covering the same ground. Of the oral kind, there are 101 exercises for Caesar, or an average of nearly three a week through the year. The consecutive material, if 15 lines were reckoned for a lesson, would make 35 lessons more, raising the average to four a week. It is quite obvious that only a small part of this amount can be written by the student, and that the selection will be made from the oral part. *The appearance of the giving of a good deal of drill on a given construction is thus purely deceptive*, as it is, in fact, for the same reason, wherever it is presented in our composition books.

The sentences in part have some bearing on Caesar's story.

In part they have nothing to do with it, unless they contradict it. Thus, "There is no doubt that he was burned" (belonging to chap. iv) either refers to some unknown person not in the text, or to Orgetorix, about whom the one thing sure is that he was *not* burned. Many are quite meaningless, as "the enemy could not be restrained from telling the cause of the danger," "the fugitives are advancing close up to the veteran legions," "several were found who formed a phalanx" (a phalanx composed of several persons would not be very effective). It is easy enough to compose such sentences; but it is safe to say that no one would understand Caesar's narrative better for reading them, and that there is nothing in them to give the student the idea that the study of Latin might be an interesting and profitable intellectual pursuit. But in saying this I beg not to be understood as meaning it of this book alone. A large part of the sentences in nearly all our books are either silly, or confusing, or both.

The book shares a fault with all the composition books, so far as I know, that have been written. *Constructions are called for before they are treated.* Thus the first lesson ostensibly treats only the subject nominative and predicate nominative, thereby looking very simple. But the English sentences call for the application of *fifteen* principles. Again, it is bad method to put the sentence "don't you know what he has done," even with the direction "*perf. subj.*" in parentheses, when the construction of the indirect question is first treated on p. 16, ten lessons later.

Barss' *Writing Latin* (Book I—Second Year Work) is difficult to classify. The preface says that the method "is intended to provide a rational and systematic treatment of the difficulties which assail the beginner," and also that "the order of subjects is unconventional," bringing together "things naturally associated in the mind," as the possessive dative and the possessive genitive. "Not until frequent repetition has insured something like mastery of the indicative mood and the common case-constructions are the other moods introduced." The exercises do not carry out this last statement. The very first lesson calls for the deliberative subjunctive, as do also the fourth and seventh; but the construc-

tion is *nowhere* taken up for treatment. The exercises of the first twenty-six lessons are suggested by Caesar, Cicero's *Orationes*, and other sources. Even the Caesar material is not used historically. Thus Alesia, which belongs to the seventh book, appears in the tenth lesson. Words and ideas that are not in Caesar are freely used, as in "citizens, you are pale with anger and fear," given to illustrate the ablative of cause, in Lesson III. The word *pallidus*, used in the Latin illustration, occurs in no writing of Caesar and in no oration of Cicero. So far, the book belongs to Type I. After twenty-six lessons of this general character, twenty-one sets of exercises appear, based on parts of the first and second books of the *Gallic War*. Here the book belongs to Type III.

IV. *The type which attempts to combine the advantages of the last two by uniting a systematic syntax with exercises based upon a specified text.*—An illustration may be seen in D'Ooge's *Latin Composition* (Part I, based on Caesar; 1904). The plan is clearly stated in the following extract from the preface:

Part I is based on Caesar's *Gallic War* for vocabulary, idioms, and general content; but in syntax the exercises are made to conform to the systematic presentation of the subject which characterizes the lessons throughout. To take up constructions in Latin composition in the capricious order in which they happen to occur in the accompanying text has been shown to be pedagogically unsound and fatally weak in that the subjects are not presented in their proper order or logical course of development, and the student is unable to bring the disorganized bits of knowledge thus acquired into a strong and well-organized synthetic whole. The constructions have, therefore, been taken up in their grammatical sequence, and the exercises are preceded by appropriate grammar-lessons; next follow selected idioms to be memorized, and finally the sentences aim to give practical and illuminating expression to the syntax and idioms that precede.

This programme sounds well, and promises us the desired solution of our difficulties. Let us see how it works in practice. D'Ooge's exercises follow the text of the *Gallic War*, chapter by chapter, with an occasional grouping of the material of two chapters into one lesson, or a subdivision of a long chapter. In part they are for oral work, and here the sentences have no connection; in part they are for written work, and here they are

continuous. Most of the material is of the former kind. There are 110 Lessons, none of them short. The student must write three of them each week, or the teacher must select. The latter, of course, is what takes place.

The order in which the syntax is taken up is: Word-Order, etc., Agreement, the Indicative Mood, the Subjunctive Mood in Independent Sentences, the Imperative Mood, Moods and Tenses in Dependent and Substantive Clauses, Moods in Indirect Discourse, Nouns and Adjective Forms of the Verb, Syntax of Pronouns, Syntax of Nouns. This brings the beginning of the treatment of the cases on p. 100. Up to this point not a word is said about the use of cases outside of the construction of subject and predicate. But of course the cases have been freely used throughout these one hundred pages. What we have, then, up to this point, is *systematic treatment of the verb*, with *systematic silence about the noun*. The theory of one part completely contradicts that of the other. How, then, is the student to manage his cases *before* p. 100? He must either write them at haphazard, getting them right or wrong, as may be, or he must get them right by imitation of his Latin original. That is an excellent way to get them. But if the student has learned to use the dative after *persuadeo* in the third lesson (as he either does, or is allowed to write the wrong case), then he does not need to take up the subject, with formal statement and grammatical references, in the ninety-fifth lesson. The same thing holds for the dative after verbs compounded with certain prepositions, the objective genitive, the genitive of the whole, the ablative with *potior*, the ablative of specification, all of which have to be used in this same third lesson, p. 6, but are treated for the first time in the last fifth of the book.

Against this method of teaching constructions, I set up the tenet that *the place in which a construction has for the first time to be written is the place where it should be treated*; and this should be *directly after an actual occurrence of the construction in the text which the student is reading*.

But let us see whether the verb fares better. The author has said, "to take up constructions in Latin composition in the

capricious order in which they happen to occur in the accompanying text has been shown to be pedagogically unsound." I maintain that it is far more unsound to ask the student to *write* them in the capricious order in which they occur, *before* they are taken up at all. But this is what is done again and again, apparently without reserve. Thus *quin* with the subjunctive is taken up in the thirty-eighth lesson, but written in the fourth. The supine in (-u) is taken up in the eighty-second lesson (corresponding to III, 23, where it does not occur), but written in the fourth. The "substantive clause of purpose" (one of the bad names due to the Allen and Greenough *Grammar*, and still to be found there) is taken up in the twenty-eighth lesson, but written in the third. Moreover, in this same third lesson, the student has to distinguish between this construction and the infinitive construction, in writing the sentences, "He persuaded the Helvetii that they excelled all in valor," and "Orgetorix will persuade them to go forth from their boundaries." And all this without a word of help in the accompanying notes.

In the interest of a supposed system, too, a large number of constructions are treated and illustrated that do not occur at all in the text covered (i-iv), for example, wishes (every kind is treated), prohibitions with the perfect subjunctive or *noli* and the infinitive, polite or modest assertions, relative clauses with the subjunctive after *dignus*, etc., the genitive after verbs of accusing or condemning, the ablative after *dignus* or *indignus*, etc. Rare constructions are also treated, as the expression of the conclusion contrary to fact in indirect discourse—a difficult construction, occurring only twice in *B.G.* i-iv, but sixteen times within a few lessons in D'Ooge's book; the ablative with *opus* and *usus*, which occurs once in the Caesar (and not at all in the six orations of Cicero ordinarily read); *paenitet* with the genitive, which occurs once in the Caesar (*pudet* with the genitive is also called for, though the word does not occur in Caesar); *interest* with the genitive or the feminine ablative of the possessive, of which the former occurs in two examples in one place in the Caesar, and the latter, which is called for in D'Ooge's English sentences, not at all; the genitive of plenty and want, which according to Byrne

does not appear at all in the Caesar or the Cicero ordinarily read (nor, as a matter of fact, in D'Ooge's English sentences).

Now, it seems quite obvious that drill on so many constructions that are not in our high-school Caesar, and drill upon a number that are rare, makes this, or any other book that includes them, needlessly difficult. And needless difficulties certainly are not wanted in the composition of the Caesar year.

Miss Mellick's *Latin Composition for Classes Reading Caesar* (1901) gives a "systematic" treatment of syntax, with exercises based on Caesar, and roughly following the narrative, though containing much that is imaginary (as where "the Helvetii attempted to go out of their territories into Aquitania"). The sentences are in part disconnected, in part continuous. As in all our books, constructions are used before being "taken up." Thus the "double accusative" is called for in the first lesson, but first taken up in the fourth (where *rogo*, which Caesar never uses with two accusatives, is employed). Again, the deliberative subjunctive has to be written in Lesson VI, but is nowhere treated.

In this book, the systematic treatment which the preface announces is not effected by following the order in any grammar, but by the grouping of construction according to the author's judgment of what is most helpful.

Another way in which the attempt is made to combine a systematic treatment of syntax with adaptation to a text is by beginning with a methodical syntax—i.e., a short grammar (minus forms) by the author—and then proceeding to the exercises. There are three books in this class.

In Dodge and Tuttle's *Latin Prose Composition, Based on Caesar, Nepos, and Cicero* (1898) the grammatical introduction with statements and references, divided into thirty-six lessons, is arranged with a view to exhibit together, or in succession, constructions which have points of likeness or of contrast. Thus the genitive and dative of possession appear together in XII. In XIII, the genitive and ablative of description are given with the heading "Description—By Phrase," and description by clause ("subjunctive of characteristic") follows in the next lesson

with the heading "Description—By Clause."² This general idea is sound, and important. In detail, I should differ from the authors at many points. There is no real conflict, in actual practice, between the genitive of possession and the dative of possession; and the student would gain more by seeing the latter treated immediately after, or in connection with, the usage of the *dative* out of which it has grown. In the general plan a defect, to my mind, lies in the fact that the grammatical introduction is intended to serve both for the Caesar year and for the Cicero year, and thus is too full for the former. Various constructions that do not occur in Caesar are treated, and practice is given upon them in the exercises. These are continuous, and follow the actual narrative. The exact chapters upon which a given set of exercises is based is indicated. The exercises upon Caesar follow the order, books ii, iii, iv, i, in accordance with the order of reading in some schools. There are thirty-three of these sets of exercises. They are long, and it would require double that number of lessons to prepare them. The subjects taken up conform, set by set, to the lessons in the grammatical part; but no such limit is placed upon the constructions called for in translating. Thus the first set, corresponding to Lesson I, upon the Arrangement of the Sentence, calls for the subjunctive with *cum* (treated in Lesson XXI), and the indirect question (treated in XXXII), etc. Occasional references in footnotes help out (as for the indirect question, though not for the *cum*-clause); but the method is wasteful of effort.

In this book, references are given, in the introductory syntax, to various grammars.

Mather and Wheeler's *Connected Passages for Latin Prose Writing* (1899) open with a syntax of sixty-nine pages, intended to cover two years of composition, and arranged in a sequence

² Admirable! But how can the authors then have failed to call the construction the "descriptive relative clause," as I do? How should a clause be named, for either scientific or pedagogical purposes, except by its actual force—especially if the name thus indicated also brings out the element which the construction has in common with others, as, in the present instance, with the descriptive genitive and ablative, and the descriptive adjective?

corresponding in general to that of the grammars. There are no references to grammars. In other words, the authors have substituted a methodical syntax of their own for the syntax of the grammar which the student chances to be using. The exercises, which (for the first year) are based on the *Gallic War*, iii, iv, and various "Lives" of Nepos, are continuous, with exact indication of the text corresponding. Any kind of construction, it would seem, is used anywhere. The first set of exercises, for example, is rich with constructions. A certain amount of help is given by hints, or references to the introduction, in footnotes. The latter, of course, tell the student in effect just what case or just what part of the verb to write.

Pearson's *Latin Prose Composition* (1903) similarly begins with a methodical syntax, of eighty pages, with references grouped in masses. This is intended to cover two years of composition. Exercises follow, arranged to correspond to the text, chapter by chapter, beginning with book i of the *Gallic War*. There is a very large number of sets, but they average of moderate length. There is no continuous English until book iv, chap. ii, is reached. At the head of each set for books i and ii a few Latin sentences or phrases are given, with translations, and the principles involved appear in the sentences for translation. But there are few grammatical references, and the constructions called for appear in no order of relationship or difficulty.³

Through this long review, which I should have been glad to

³ Five titles remain, to make the list of important manuals of the last forty years complete, so far as I know it. These are Baker and Inglis' *High-School Course in Latin Composition* (Macmillan), Allen and Phillips' *Latin Composition* (Allyn and Bacon), and Elizabeth M. Tyng's *Latin Prose Exercises for Second Year Work* (Longmans, Green, & Co.), Scott and Van Tuyl's *A Caesar Composition Book* (Scott, Foresman & Co.), and my own *Latin Composition* (Part I, Based on Caesar) (Atkinson, Mentzer & Grover). The last two are now appearing, and will fall to some future critic to consider. The first three, which appeared in 1909, are reviewed elsewhere in the present number of the *School Review*. Attention is also called to a review of Elmore's *Book of Latin Prose Composition, for the Use of Colleges and Advanced Classes in Schools* (Benj. H. Sanborn & Co., 1909).

I hope that I have included all the books which may be said to be now in the field. It appears to me that anyone who writes with a desire to influence teaching owes this in fairness to his readers, rather than a list of books selected

make shorter if I could at the same time have made it definite, I reach the conclusion that, after all our experimenting, our composition books are full of faults. They are unpractical. Nearly all disorganize their own plans by presenting the student with a large number of lessons, of which he can hope to write but a part. They drill him on a large number of constructions that do not occur at all in Caesar, and on a number that occur, but are rare. They use constructions, and often some of the most difficult, before they are taken up. Most of them present subject-matter which, even if in form it seems to resemble that of Caesar, is in general aimless in its contents, often silly, and sometimes even contradictory of the story as Caesar tells it. Instead of throwing light upon his narrative, their material for translation spreads darkness, and tends to make the whole business of Latin composition look unreal and unattractive. In a word, they are not adapted to the end in view. I draw the conclusion that the supposed hardness and disagreeableness of the study lies, in a very considerable degree, not in the nature of the subject itself, but in the books with which it has to be pursued.

Now let us sketch, in a few words, a type (the fifth) to which I believe the books that ultimately will be written and accepted will belong.

Its characteristics will be: no waste; a *feasible number of lessons*—that is, a number of which every one, and every sentence in it, may be written in the year—and *reading and writing hand in hand*. This means exact adaptation to the text selected, as the student reads on, week after week through the year; the words to be selected from this reading, the incidents to be selected from this; *the constructions likewise* to be selected from this; no constructions to be used that are not in Caesar, or absolutely necessary for the clear understanding of those that are; no constructions to be used *before* being taken up; constructions to be

according to his own personal likings or his affiliations. The principle is not generally acted upon. Professor Lodge was quite right in censuring the violation of it in the discussion of manuals for beginners in a recent book reviewed by him in the *Classical Weekly*.

taken up only where the student has *just seen them* in Caesar; and constructions to be taken up, illustrated, and explained, in an *organic* treatment. In this last point, selection and organic treatment, will be the specifically new feature of the fifth type. There have been hints of it, but it has nowhere been successfully accomplished, or even distinctly held in mind as a fundamental principle. If one knows where every construction that occurs in Caesar is, and expends time and thought upon the most effective framing of his plan, something approaching the ideal may be reached. Caesar has given us so many examples that one can exercise a considerable choice of order.

I should like to make the critical point as clear as I can, without taking space for illustrations. The fifth type will base its syntax, like its subject-matter and its vocabulary, upon the student's actual reading, as it progresses day by day. But it will not take *any* syntax of a given division of reading, any more than it will take *any incident*, or *any word*. It will select the one, as it does the others, by a plan studied out and articulated with the utmost care. Its keynote will be, adapted subject-matter, *and adapted syntax*. And this last will not be at all what has thus far been known as "systematic" syntax.

I had hoped to be able to discuss these points, and in particular the last, in this article. As things are, I must postpone them to a possible later day.